

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the non-final Office Action dated July 2, 2007. Claims 8, 25, 30, 33, 35 to 37, and 46 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 1, 9, 18, 28, 34, 38, 41, and 47 have been amended and claims 49-57 have been added. Support for the amendments and new claims may be found throughout Applicants' specification, for example, at paragraphs [0035] to [0045] referring to FIG. 3 and paragraphs [0065] to [0070] referring to FIG. 6. Claims 1 to 7, 9 to 24, 26 to 29, 31, 32, 34, 38 to 45, and 47 to 57 remain in the application, of which claims 1, 18, 28, 38, and 54 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Initially, the Applicants' undersigned representative thanks Examiner Zhen for the thoughtful courtesies and kind treatment afforded during the telephone interview conducted on September 20, 2007. During the interview, Examiner Zhen and Applicants' representative discussed amended independent claim 1 with respect to the cited references. Examiner Zhen agreed that the amendments to independent claim 1 would overcome the current rejection over Maffeis (U.S. Patent No. 6,721,779) in view of Yee (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,975). See Interview Summary of September 20, 2007. This reply reflects the substance of the interview.

In the Office Action, claims 1-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Maffeis in view of Yee. Based on the discussion in the telephone interview conducted on September 20, 2007 and the following remarks, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections and further examination are respectfully requested.

Referring to particular claim language, independent claim 1 recites a computer-implemented method of exchanging information among applications comprising, *inter alia*, determining an event type associated with a common format data object and selecting, from among multiple communication channels each corresponding to a specific event type, a communication channel corresponding to the determined event type. The method also comprises publishing the common format data object to the selected communication channel and prioritizing communication of the published common format data object on the selected communication channel based on a relative priority associated with the selected communication channel.

Independent claims 18, 28, and 38, although different in scope from claim 1 and each other, recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to independent claim 1.

New independent claim 54 recites a computer-implemented method of exchanging information among applications comprising, *inter alia*, prioritizing communication of a first common format data object on a first channel and communication of a second common format data object on a second channel to ensure that the first common format data object corresponding to a first business event and the second common format data object corresponding to a second business event are sent to applications in a correct order. The method also comprises publishing a first acknowledgement message to a third channel assigned to communicate acknowledgement messages, the third channel being different than the first channel and the second channel and the first acknowledgement message indicating success or failure of communication of the first business event to the second application. The method further comprises publishing a second acknowledgement message to the third channel assigned to communicate acknowledgement messages, the second acknowledgement message indicating success or failure of communication of the second business event to the third application.

The applied art is not seen to disclose, teach or suggest the foregoing features recited by the independent claims. In particular, as discussed in the telephone interview of September 20, 2007, neither Maffeis, Yee, nor a proper combination of the two is seen to disclose at least the features of selecting, from among multiple communication channels each corresponding to a specific event type, a communication channel corresponding to an event type determined to be associated with a common format data object, publishing the common format data object to the selected communication channel, and prioritizing communication of the published common format data object on the selected communication channel based on a relative priority associated with the selected communication channel (claims 1, 18, 28, and 38). In addition, neither Maffeis, Yee, nor a proper combination of the two is seen to disclose at least the features of prioritizing communication of a first common format data object on a first channel and communication of a second common format data object on a second channel to ensure that the first common format data object corresponding to a first business event and the second common

format data object corresponding to a second business event are sent to applications in a correct order, publishing a first acknowledgement message to a third channel assigned to communicate acknowledgement messages, and publishing a second acknowledgement message to the third channel assigned to communicate acknowledgement messages (claim 54).

Based on the discussion in the telephone interview conducted on September 20, 2007, independent claims 1, 18, 28, and 38 are believed to be allowable over the applied references. In addition, Applicants submit that the cited references fail to describe or suggest the features of new independent claim 54 discussed above and, thus, new independent claim 54 is believed to be allowable over the cited references. The other rejected claims and new claims in the application are each dependent on these independent claims and are thus believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each claim is deemed to define additional aspects of the disclosure, however, the individual consideration of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, objection, issue, or comment, including the Office Action's characterizations of the reference, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation. Since the amendments made herein have been made solely in an effort to expedite advancement of this case, the Applicants reserves the right to prosecute the rejected claims in further prosecution of this or related applications.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant : Lise Wiseman et al.
Serial No. : 09/927,957
Filed : August 9, 2001
Page : 19 of 19

Attorney's Docket No.: 12587-008001 / 01315-00/US

The fee in the amount of \$260.00 in payment of the excess claims fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 1, 2007

/Jeremy J. Monaldo/
Jeremy J. Monaldo
Reg. No. 58,680

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331